

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the preceding amendments and the following remarks, which are responsive to the non-final Office Action mailed February 5, 2007. Independent Claims 9, 15 and 19 and dependent Claims 12-13 have been amended, and Claims 1-8, 10-11, 16 and 18 have been canceled. Following this Amendment, Claims 9, 12-15, 17 and 19-23 are pending in the present application.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-9, 14, 15 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,475,843 to Halviatti et al. (hereinafter “Halviatti” or “the Halviatti patent”). Furthermore, Claims 10-13, 16, 17 and 19-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Halviatti in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,634,098 to Janniro et al. (hereinafter “Janniro” or “the Janniro patent”). Each of these rejections is addressed below.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

On Page 2 of the Office Action, Claims 1-9, 14, 15 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Halviatti. As noted above, Claims 1-8 and 18 have been canceled. To anticipate a claim, the cited reference must teach each and every element of the claim. *See* MPEP 2131; *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Independent Claim 9

Applicants respectfully submit that Independent Claims 9, as amended, is not anticipated by Halviatti. Independent Claim 9 has been amended to include limitations similar to those recited in dependent Claims 10 and 11, now canceled, as well as additional limitations that further define the invention over the prior art of record. Specifically, independent Claim 9 as amended recites that the configuration table is stored in a *spread sheet format for ease of editing by a user, said spread sheet being configured for allowing said user to simultaneously view in a tabular format the plurality of possible value sets that are selectable in association with each said configuration item group*. Claim 9 has also been amended to clarify that the configuration

table includes *a plurality of user-defined configurations, each said configuration comprising a collection of value sets corresponding to respective configuration item groups, each said value set being one of a plurality of possible value sets that are selectable in association with said respective item group, each said value set comprising a collection of one or more related configuration items and corresponding values for said related items.* Support for these amendments can be found, for example, on pages 15-16, and in Figs. 4A-4C, of the present Application.

Because these limitations are not disclosed or even suggested by Halviatti, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 9, as amended, is patentable over Halviatti. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Claim 14 depends from Claim 9 and therefore includes all of the limitations of that Claim plus additional limitations that further define the invention over the prior art. Thus, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 9 as amended, it is submitted that Claim 14 is also patentable over Halviatti.

Independent Claim 15

Independent Claim 15 has been amended to recite limitations similar to the limitations recited above with respect to Claim 9. For example, independent Claim 15, as amended, includes the step of *storing a configuration table having a plurality of user-defined configurations, each configuration comprising a collection of value sets corresponding to respective configuration item groups, each said value set being one of a plurality of possible value sets that are selectable in association with said respective item group, each said value set comprising a collection of one or more related configuration items and corresponding values for said related items.* Claim 15 has also been amended to recite that the *configuration table is stored in a spread sheet format for ease of editing by a user, said spread sheet being configured for allowing said user to simultaneously view in a tabular format the plurality of possible value sets that are selectable in association with each said configuration item group.*

Because these limitations are not disclosed or even suggested by Halviatti, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 15, as amended, is patentable over Halviatti. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

On Page 9 of the Office Action, Claims 10-13, 16, 17 and 19-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Halviatti in view of Janniro.

A *prima facie* case of obviousness requires that: (1) the prior art references teach or suggest all of the features of the claimed invention; (2) there is some suggestion or motivation to modify or combine the prior art references; and, (3) there is a reasonable expectation of success in combining the prior art references. MPEP § 2142; *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Independent Claim 9

Because Janniro does not disclose or even suggest the above noted deficiencies of the Halviatti patent, it is submitted that independent Claim 9, as amended, is patentable over the prior art or record. As described above, independent Claim 9 has been amended to include limitations similar to those previously recited in dependent Claims 10 and 11, now canceled, as well as additional limitations that further define the invention over the prior art of record. Although the Examiner concedes that these limitations are not disclosed in Halviatti, the Office Action asserts that such limitations are disclosed in Janniro and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Halviatti with Janniro. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Janniro patent is directed to a method and apparatus for performing automated software testing based on the values of environment variables specified in files stored in a hierarchical directory structure. *See* Janniro, col. 1:64-2:19. More specifically, Janniro is directed to a process that allows the testing environment for any given test to be specified in successive stages. In the first stage, the testing environment is established based on a predefined or "packaged" environment specified in an environment file. In each successive stage, the environment is modified based on increasingly test-specific environment configuration files. *See* Janniro, col. 10:51-57. Thus, Janniro discloses a testing process that involves using a plurality of different configuration files stored in a plurality of directories, wherein each individual configuration file includes a number of configuration items that are stored in a traditional name-value pair listing format.

Janniro does not, however, disclose or even suggest the use of a configuration table that

is stored in a *spread sheet format for ease of editing by a user, said spread sheet being configured for allowing said user to simultaneously view in a tabular format the plurality of possible value sets that are selectable in association with each said configuration item group.* Nor does Janniro disclose or suggest the use of *a single configuration table that includes a plurality of user-defined configurations, each said configuration comprising a collection of value sets corresponding to respective configuration item groups, each said value set being one of a plurality of possible value sets that are selectable in association with said respective item group, each said value set comprising a collection of one or more related configuration items and corresponding values for said related items.* In contrast to what is disclosed in the prior art, these features allow a test developer to easily view, edit, and update related information associated with a plurality of different configurations in a single integrated and easy to use programming environment.

Because Halviatti and Janniro, taken individually or combined, do not disclose or even suggest each of the recited limitations, it is submitted that independent Claim 9, as amended, is patentable over the prior art or record. Moreover, there appears to be no motivation that would have led the person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the Halviatti patent with the Janniro patent. Thus, for at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 9 as amended is patentable over the prior art.

Claims 12-14 depend from Claim 9 and therefore include all of the limitations of that claim. Thus, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 9 as amended, it is submitted that Claims 12-14 are also patentable over the prior art of record.

Independent Claim 15

Independent Claim 15 has been amended to recite limitations similar to the limitations recited above with respect to Claim 9. Because Janniro does not disclose or even suggest the above noted deficiencies of the Halviatti patent, it is submitted that independent Claim 15, as amended, is patentable over the prior art of record. Moreover, there appears to be no motivation that would have led the person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the Halviatti patent with the Janniro patent. Thus, for at least these reasons, it is submitted that independent Claim 15, as amended, is patentable over the prior art.

Claim 17 depends from Claim 15 and includes all of the limitations of that Claim. Thus, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent Claims 15, as amended, it is submitted that Claim 17 is patentable over the prior art.

Independent Claim 19

Clarifying amendments have been made to independent Claim 19 to more clearly define Applicants' invention. Contrary to the assertions made on Page 11 of the Office Action, it is submitted that the Halviatti patent does not anywhere disclose or even suggest a method that involves identifying a particular Graphical User Interface (GUI) control on a target device by using *a first table that includes a data field for optionally storing a control-specific identify flag to be used by said test tool for indicating to said test agent which properties are to be used in identifying that control on the target device*, as recited in independent Claim 19. Nor, as the Examiner concedes, does Halviatti disclose or suggest using *a second table that includes a default identify flag to be used by said test tool for indicating to said test agent which of said properties are to be used for identifying any control of that class type that does not have a control-specific identify flag associated with it, as defined in said first table*.

In Halviatti, a link is established to an individual resource or control by indicating a selected one of its Windows class name, Window title, or Resource ID, all of which are readily accessible Windows data structures. See Halviatti, col. 9:59-65. Halviatti does not, however, teach or even suggest using a table for optionally storing a *control-specific identify flag* for indicating which properties are to be used in identifying a particular GUI control on the target device, as recited in independent Claim 19. Nor does Halviatti teach or suggest having two levels of configurability for defining properties used to "find" a particular GUI control on the target device, which involves using a first table having a *control-specific identify flag* and a second table having a *default identify flag* for identifying any control of that class type that does not have a control-specific identify flag associated with it.

The present invention allows a user to specify a combination of several Window properties or attributes including, for example, Caption Text(Window Title), Position(X,Y), Size(Height, Width), Class, WindowID(ResourceID), Zorder, Window Style, Extended Window Style, etc. A particular class type such as 'button' can be configured to use any combination of

these exemplary attributes to allow the test tool to "find" the control on the target device. This is accomplished in part by defining a default identify flag for that class type that specifies which of said properties are to be used in finding a control of that class type. Once the test tool finds a control, the user will be able to simulate events such as mouse clicks on that control. The default identify flag properties defined for a particular class will be used for all Windows controls within an application which are of the same defined class type (e.g., All 'button' class types will use the same default identify flags). However, the user also has the ability to optionally define identify flags for each specific control within the application. This allows for greater flexibility and accuracy in identifying controls on the target device. The default identify flags defined for 'button' class, for example, might not work for a specific 'button' control. In this scenario, the user has the ability to override the default identify flags with ones for that specific control by defining control-specific identify flags, as recited in independent Claim 19.

Because Janniro does not disclose or even suggest the above noted deficiencies of the Halviatti patent, it is submitted that independent Claim 19, as amended, is patentable over the prior art of record. Contrary to the assertions made on Page 12 of the Office Action, Janniro nowhere discloses the limitations discussed above with respect to independent Claim 19. In fact, after having carefully reviewed the Janniro patent in its entirety and, in particular, the portions cited to in the Office Action, Applicants respectfully submit that the Janniro patent does not disclose or suggest any approach to identifying GUI controls on a target device, never mind the specific approach recited in independent Claim 19, as amended. This is because Janniro is not directed to a test tool for testing output rendered to a Graphical User Interface (GUI), but rather is directed to a general software test environment such as might be used for testing more traditional Fortran or Cobol based applications. Moreover, even had Janniro managed to address the above noted deficiencies of the Halviatti patent, which it clearly does not, there appears to be no motivation that would have led the person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Halviatti with Janniro. Thus, for at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 19 as amended, is patentable over the prior art.

Claims 20-23 depend from Claim 19 and include all of the limitations of that Claim plus additional limitations that further define the invention over the prior art. Thus, for at least the

Appl. No.: 10/799,904
Amdt. dated May 1, 2007
Reply to Office Action of February 5, 2007

reasons set forth above with respect to independent Claim 19, as amended, it is submitted that Claims 20-23 are patentable over the prior art.

Conclusion

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the non-final Office Action of February 5, 2007. The foregoing amendments to the claims, when taken in conjunction with the appended remarks, are believed to have placed the present application in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at (404) 881-7452 to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present application.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,

/Stephen G. McNiff/

Stephen G. McNiff
Registration No. 53,305

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Atlanta Office (404) 881-7000
Fax Atlanta Office (404) 881-7777

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON May 1, 2007.